

**TRANSPAC Meeting Summary Minutes**

**MEETING DATE:** March 21, 2012

**ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Julie Pierce (Chair), Clayton; David Durant (Vice Chair), Pleasant Hill; Kristina Lawson, Walnut Creek; Ron Leone, Concord; Bill Shinn, Concord

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Tim McGallian (Alternate), Concord

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Cliff Glickman, (for CC Supervisor, Karen Mitchoff); Steve Goetz, Contra Costa County; Deirdre Heitman, June Garrett, BART; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC

**GUEST PRESENTERS:** Gail Murray, BART Board of Directors, and BART General Manager, Grace Crunican

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:** Marilyn Geren, TRANSPAC Staff

TRANSPAC reserves the right to take formal action on any item included on this agenda, whether or not a form of resolution, motion or other indication that action will be taken is included on the agenda or attachments thereto.

**Chair Pierce convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.**

**1. Pledge of Allegiance/Self introductions - Completed**

**2. Public Comment – None**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**3. Approval of February 9, 2012 Minutes**

**4. Approval of East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) Reallocation Request**

**ACTION: Approved Consent items. Shinn/Lawson/Unanimous**

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

**5. Discussion with BART Director Gail Murray and BART General Manager Grace Crunican**

Chair Pierce introduced BART Director, Gail Murray. Ms. Murray in turn, introduced Grace Crunican, BART General Manager. Ms. Crunican was hired by BART in August 2011, and comes with the following credentials: she is in charge of over 3,000 employees, has 32 years experience, has served as the Director of the Seattle Department of Transportation, Director of Oregon Department of Transportation, Deputy Director of the Federal Transit Administration, and the Deputy Director of the Portland, Oregon Department of Transportation.

Member Durant arrived at 9:04 am.

Ms. Murray thanked TRANSPAC for changing its meeting date, and gave an update on the Walnut Creek Transit Village, which is now going through the Environmental Impact Study process, and should be finished in the spring. It will then go to the City Council for approval and is expected to be a good market for apartments.

The Contra Costa Centre Transit Village is doing very well. It opened for leasing last April, and is 95% leased. The retail portion of the Transit Village is not doing as well, with only about 20% of the retail being leased. There will be additional “for sale” housing and commercial leasing, but only when the economy improves.

BART ridership has increased dramatically: 340,000 trips per day last year as opposed to 370,000 trips per day this year. Concord lines have the best trains because the ridership is so much more. If cars are not in for maintenance, they are on the tracks, so there are more “short trains” on the tracks, and this is the reason BART needs new cars. A contract for a new car builder will be awarded probably next month. The busiest station is Del Norte, and Walnut Creek is the second busiest. Between 2010 and 2011, the ridership grew by 5%.

The “crossover” is between Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill stations, and is in the testing phase, but it is completed. The crossover is needed to allow trains to detour around a disabled train, which previously would cause the whole system to be stopped. Eventually, a train will be able to be inserted onto the crossover, as well.

eBART is under construction and will go to Hillcrest station. The transfer platform is being built, but it cannot be completed until Highway 4 is finished, because it is located in the median. It is expected to open in 2016.

Construction related to the earthquake safety program has caused parking spaces to be blocked off. In 2004, the voters voted an approximate \$1 billion bond measure for that program, so all of the aerial structures and parking lots are being brought up to current earthquake standards. Funds are available to make part of the system operational (not just hold it up, but make it run) during and after an earthquake.

Regarding the Silicon Valley extension: full funding was approved from the federal government and BART is having a ground-breaking on April 12. The Warm Springs extension needs to be built first (the last station being built in Alameda County) and the Silicon Valley Extension will be able to hook up to it. The reason Santa Clara County is getting this extension is because in 2000, voters passed a one-half cent sales tax for construction, and still did not get the federal funding because it is not in the District. So in 2008, another sales tax of one-eighth cent was passed for funding to operate it.

BART is having a State of Good Repair Tour of the Concord facility on 8:30 am-10:30 am June 8, 2012, and Director Murray invited all to attend. If you wish to go, you must reserve a space by contacting her by email, or by contacting Deirdre Heitman.

Ms. Murray introduced General Manager Grace Crunican. Ms. Crunican stated that when she came to BART she did an assessment and used the analogy of "putting a new roof on BART" in order to preserve the substructure of the system. While it might not be something that people really notice as an improvement, it is a vital component to the operation of the system. The ridership feedback reflected that reliability was most important to passengers and reliability depends on the functioning of the cars.

BART railcars are the oldest in the country. The Federal Transit Administration has estimated that the nation's largest rail systems have a backlog of \$80 billion in repair needs. In 2010, the California Transportation Commission estimated that \$142 billion was needed to repair and maintain the state's transportation needs over 10 years. BART has done an incredibly good job at replacing the parts and trying to glue things together, and at preventative maintenance, but new cars are needed.

The ridership growth is there to be gotten, so BART needs new railcars on the capacity side of things and to make sure they are capturing that market and providing the service for that 500,000 riders, which will help the roads situation, and will help with other transportation agencies. The diagnostics side of BART has looked at the Japanese model and redesigned its railcar motor rehab process. In reorganizing the rehab process the costs have been reduced from \$18,000 to \$2,000.

Ownership and responsibility are utilized in BART's Strategic Maintenance Program. Customers have given feedback that they don't feel that there are as many break-downs on BART as there used to be. The system is showing signs of age, and technology has changed dramatically. BART's number for State of Good Repair is \$7.5 Billion, which includes train control system, grinding tracks, and replacing parts.

As systems are upgraded, there is inconsistent technology because of the age of the system. The average age of BART's fleet is approximately 35 years. The industry average is 20 years, and BART is well beyond the industry average. BART's utilization of its cars is at 86%, compared to MUNI at 74%, WMATA at 80%, and MARTA at 56%. The new cars purchase issue will be coming to the Board (a draft in April and approval in May). Bombardier is the winner of the new car manufacturer race so far and instead of \$5 million per car, it will be \$2.1 million per car. This means that fewer regional funds will be needed, and making a plea to add a few more cars is being considered. BART has received very good bids on the cars.

At the state level there are cuts, and the federal level is out of money. BART lost \$100 million over the last five years from the State, and it is not looking for new money from the federal government. For the high speed rail, there was \$150 million in the High Speed Rail Connectivity Funds, and two governors have vetoed those funds being released. So BART is looking at its own budget for funds to put toward the new cars.

A presentation of the New York Subway system revealed what can happen when maintenance and replacement is delayed. It took the New York MTA three decades to recover, so it is critical to get new cars and repair the substructure. People decided to take their own vehicles instead of taking mass transit because of the lack of maintenance and reliability.

Chair Pierce questioned whether the bids will be reflected on eBART cars which were estimated to be around \$3 million per car. Ms. Crunican did not know whether it would apply.

Bob Armstrong questioned whether the old cars would be recycled or refurbished, and if they will be built in the Bay Area or shipped here. Ms. Crunican responded that some cars will be dismantled, and the best cars will be saved. No other transit system uses the gauge and type of cars BART uses so they cannot be resold. The proposed car builder has a plant in New York, so the work will be done there and possibly ship them to the Bay Area through the Canal.

Barbara Neustadter inquired about 1) updating the new train control and the challenges it presents and 2) where the train control system will be located. Ms. Crunican responded that the expense will be past \$500 million and BART will be working with MTC on this issue. It's a good time to bring on a new train control system because of the system extension south to San Jose and BART will need to reconfigure the controls for those added lines. There will not be a time when BART doesn't have a backup system. In response to where the train control system will be, the train control system is currently in the basement at Lake Merritt with the Police. BART is considering trying to relocate the Police into another building, and use the space that the Police currently occupy to expand the operations system in the Lake Merritt area.

Member Leone inquired about the estimated completion date for eBART and the extension to San Jose. Director Murray advised that completion of eBART is 2016 because of the wait for Highway 4 to be completed. BART is doing the subterranean foundational work and much work is being done. The Berryessa extension will be completed in 2018, which is only partway to San Jose because BART only has money to go that far.

Member Leone wondered if there were other considerations about extending BART. Director Murray replied that BART has talked about Livermore, and Alameda County is trying to re-up their Measure B so that money can be used to leverage other money to go there. There is another \$300,000 approved to study going to the next station after Hillcrest on eBART. Discussions will be held in May regarding the various places eBART might go in Antioch and Oakley. Chair Pierce added that there was talk about doing work with Union Pacific but at the last meeting, the price was too high. Director Murray added that West County wants a BART extension to Pinole and Hercules, but it is only in the talking stage. One Board member wants BART to the beach from Fulton to the Great Highway, but there's no money for that.

Member Durant offered that his constituents are saying that there are two big questions about BART: 1) what is BART doing to contain all those costs, other than just coming and getting more money from CCTA and other funding sources, and 2) how do the per capita costs for BART compare to other transit agencies? Ms. Crunican responded that 1) there is a four-year freeze on wages (0% increase over the next four years), and BART cut 200 employees on a base of 3,000 employees, and 2) BART's labor costs are on the higher end, but are very much in line when given the cost of living in the Bay Area.

Deirdre Heitman advised that MTC is concluding a study of transit sustainability, and BART's ratio of administrative costs compared to total costs was lower than many of the transit agencies in the Bay Area, and in line nationally. Ms. Crunican offered that in terms of costs in the Bay Area, BART has cut its costs 9% and others have gone up 10-11%. She promised to provide copies of the study. BART contained its healthcare costs and employees are paying more for it. Employee contribution to the retiree healthcare plan is being ramped up.

Steve Goetz commented that the BART cars are quite noisy and wanted to know if there is anything that can be done about the noise. Grace Crunican stated that there are a number of things that can be done with the windows and the doors (like installing "plug" doors), and plans are in place to grind the rails to make it quieter. There's also a new way that the wheel hits the rail that might be able to reduce the noise but studies have to be done before anything is done in that regard. These changes all relate to new cars. Old cars are what they are, but BART is looking at removing the cloth seats and putting in vinyl seats and to take out the carpets. The customer dissatisfaction regarding the seats was so high that the decision was made to make the changes.

Member Leone inquired about a resolution on the capacity issues and seating arrangements. Director Murray advised that she has pushed for retaining the same amount of seating as there is now. There was a real push for a lot more standing room and fewer seats. The seats will be two inches narrower and the "pitch" will be a little different to provide more space. Ms. Crunican offered that seats will be installed which can be removed easily if the configuration needs to be changed.

Member Shinn thanked the BART representatives for their report on the maintenance and the future planning for the system. He inquired about the distribution of Clipper Cards. Ms. Crunican advised that the Clipper Cards was a system made by MTC, not by BART. A problem is that the MTC staff is far removed from the customer and they don't understand it. BART is able to maintain what it has in senior and youth pass distribution. Member Shinn shared an experience in trying to get the Clipper Card, and it was a narrow timeframe in which to get the card. He suggested that a good place for distribution would be the police station with volunteers. Chair Pierce stated that the contract for the people who sell tickets at the Walnut Creek Station will sell the senior and youth tickets there. County Connection is a new site for senior tickets, and another possibility is the police station in Concord. One reason why BART is keeping the Senior and Youth tickets is because bus operators can take cash, but BART doesn't take cash. Some seniors don't go all the time and need a ticket, not a Clipper Card. Statistics show that by 2040, over 50% of the population will be 65 or older, so we need to make sure our seniors and disabled are able to get the tickets.

Member Lawson stated that she feels BART is doing a great job in customer service especially when there is an interruption in service, by keeping people informed by phone and other ways. She has noticed an improvement especially in the last six months. Ms. Crunican advised that BART is looking for a consistent service level and it will take awhile to get everyone there. There will be automated announcements on the new cars which will tell you the next stop, a display telling you where you've been, where you're going, and where you are.

Chair Pierce thanked BART for the presentation.

**ACTION: None**

## **6. BART Allocation Request for the Walnut Creek BART Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Project**

Barbara Neustadter introduced the BART request for Measure J money, Line 10 funds, a \$12 million commitment from Central County for BART parking and access and other improvements. BART is making a request for \$3.85 million for the Walnut Creek TOD project. The TAC reviewed this request and recommended approval. Deirdre Heitman explained that BART applied and was successful in getting STIP funds through CCTA, so the \$3.85 million will match those funds for approximately a \$9 million project cost for public access at the BART station pathways, the customer service center, the police substation, and additional lighting. Chair Pierce stated that it will all be integrated with the new plan for the TOD, and won't be putting something in only to tear it out later.

**ACTION: Approved. Lawson/Shinn/Unanimous**

## **7. Contra Costa – Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC) Projects Funding Recommendation**

Barbara Neustadter advised that the CCTA issued a Call for Projects for Transportation for Livable Communities Funding, and TRANSPAC jurisdictions submitted 10 applications for that funding. TAC reviewed the applications and had discussions at meetings in January and February, and has forwarded a recommendation on how to maximize the dollars available.

In Central County, there is \$5 million available. She advised that the spreadsheet provided represents what TAC believes and recommends as the smartest and best way to allocate the funds at this time. She noted that Project No. 2, "County/WCS Treat" which means a study that will be done and TAC recommended that we could decrease the amount of money down to \$75,000 because the goal was to fully fund another project. Item 5: when the CCTA Staff put together the funding for these projects, the total amount of the request was used. The \$195,000 County Olympic project crosses an RTPC line, so TRANSPAC recommended that SWAT and TRANSPAC split the costs. TRANSPAC got \$97,500 got put back into its project money, and at the same time it is recommending \$97,500 to be funded on this project and SWAT will fund the other 50% of the project.

Item No. 7, Concord, came in with the biggest request for funding of all of the jurisdictions. It is a very ambitious project having to do with a variety of pedestrian improvements throughout the City of Concord. TAC asked Concord to take a hit on the amount that they were requesting, and ended up at approximately \$2.55 million, and still were a little short. So Concord will fund their own shortfall, and as part of that action gave up \$50,000 to the City of PH Golf Club Road project, which is a widening of the bridge and the road. Item no. 10 reflects that funding for Pleasant Hill comes in at 496,200, which is still short, so the plan is that Pleasant Hill will fund that \$24,800 shortfall.

The County East Bay Regional Project Trail project and a City of Pleasant Hill Trail Enhancement project are not recommended for funding at this time.

This adds up to over \$5 million, and TAC is recommending approval of this format and of the numbers for each project to go forward to the CCTA, who would like this information in March so the allocations can move forward in April.

**ACTION: Approved: Shinn/Durant/Unanimous**

## **8. TRANSPAC CCTA Representative Reports: Reports on the most recent CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (Member Pierce), Planning Committee (Member Durant), and CCTA meetings (Members Pierce and Durant)**

Chair Pierce advised that the Administration Committee at CCTA okayed mid-year budget revisions. Legislation got some updates on what is starting to happen in the State AB710 will come back in some form, which has to do with parking at high density locations near transit. The definitions were far too broad and would have impacted downtown centers and made it impossible to have reasonable parking standards. It would have lifted all parking standards. So it will be coming back in some form and Nancy Skinner has advised that it will be a good one.

The City of Hercules Intermodal Transit Center (a multi-modal transit station that will include bus, train and ferry) on which the City has been working for approximately 10 years, has come forward with a request for appropriation of just under \$5 million. This project is programmed in the CCTA Strategic Plan and the City can get its STIP funding in April from the CTC. The City was late getting its compliance audit in to CCTA, but the audit is done and the City passed it as far as how it spent the Return to Source money. There still are many questions because of the problems in the City of Hercules, so there was more intense scrutiny. Additional conditions are suggested to be put on the allocation of this money (local STIP money) and if the City doesn't get it in this round before the end of April, it will have to wait until 2017 to be able to use this funding. If the City doesn't get this money, it probably won't get the CTC STIP money and if it doesn't get that, then it fails to qualify for its TIGER 2 funds which have been programmed but not allocated. The City has been told by the Feds that it is in the running for TIGER 4 money and once it gets these other things in line, it should come back for TIGER 4 money. The City has finished its federal NIPA clearance, and once that is done, it will do value engineering on the project.

The plans were to put the train station in first, then the bus intermodal and then the ferry. This does not make sense in this economy, so the City has been advised to value engineer the plans to make it work as soon as possible. Recommendations for conditions are that the City gets money from CTC (local STIP dollars) conditional upon them getting the money from CTC the end of April. The City needs that money to qualify for all the rest. If the City cannot get the CTC funding, then determination will need to be made about using local money. What the City can get out of the local money right now is purchase of right-of-way, which allows access to their site, and the building of a section of the Bay Trail and helping with the construction of a critical bridge on John Muir Parkway that goes across the creek. The City must have a usable transit connection so it needs to figure out how to reconfigure and get busses in out as soon as possible. Staff have proposed other conditions to make it more secure – for example, not purchasing the right-of-way. The City of Hercules has been up for criticism, but its brand new team, including City Manager Steve Duran, has assured CCTA that there will not be one dime of money in any of these projects that is not already in the bank with no other takers for it.

Member Durant advised that at the planning committee there was a difficult conversation about the Safe Routes 2 School project, and as a result, they are taking another look at the project. He did not feel that some things scheduled under Task 1 were adequately completed and gave him concern about going forward with funding. One of the issues in Task 1, required that the consultant conduct a series of interviews, gather information from a broad range of people, including parents of children going to these schools. In the report, there was a lot of information from administrators and a little information from agencies of local government. But there was nothing from parents of children. There is a disconnect if teachers and parents are not included. He is hopeful that there will be a better report representing the activities going on for SR2S and to incorporate that information better and more thoroughly in a broader, county-wide plan.

**ACTION: Information Received**

**9. SB 375/SCS Report by Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, Planning**

Chair Pierce pointed out that there are no actions on this item, so if Member Lawson needs to leave at 10:30, it is fine.

Martin Engelmann handed out information for the presentation. The Status of Developing a Sustainable Community Strategy (this is MTC and ABAG's SCS).

Last year MTC adopted performance targets for evaluating projects and for evaluating alternative scenarios. MTC defined five different sustainable community scenarios, and asked CCTA to submit projects. CCTA submitted many billions of dollars of projects all of which are getting into the RTP, and then developed specific scenarios and did some detailed tests. A number of public workshops were held and are at the point of developing and approving a preferred SCS that will occur between March and May, and are calling it the "Jobs Housing Connection." Mr. Engelmann presented a chart that indicates the overall household growth forecast for the Bay Region. When it was started a year and a half ago, there were current regional plans which would have been projections 2011, (kind of business as usual or what would have happened had we not had an SCS) and assumed 772,000 new households for the Bay Area. The initial vision was that everybody who works in the Bay Area and lives in the Bay Area will have a house that will be affordable. That sent the forecast up to a million homes in the initial vision. The alternative scenarios requested more realistic numbers, and the forecast went down to 770,000. With the preferred jobs housing alternative, the forecast is at 700,000 units.

Regarding foreclosures and vacancies, 40,000 of those households will be absorbed in vacant units, so there will be only 660,000 new housing units over the next 30 years, which is 22,000 dwelling units per year, and is a reasonable forecast.

Jobs started at 1.4 million in growth, 1.5 million for the initial vision, down to below a million for the alternative scenarios. Now there is a balance of about 1.1 million new jobs in the Bay Area in the next 30 years. Jobs are impossible to predict; it has very little impact on the jurisdictions in terms of legal requirements in the future. The scenarios were current regional plans, initial vision, core concentration, focus growth, constrained core concentration, outward growth (move the Contra Costa jobs out to East County) and Jobs Housing.

There are two transportation networks: 1) financially constrained network (T2035) and 2) core transit network (leans more toward transit than roadways).

The greenhouse gas emission targets are set by the Air Board, and the target is based upon a metric of per capita reductions per passenger vehicle and light truck emissions related to 2005 as a baseline and excludes credits for any kind of more efficient vehicle or clean fuel regulations. It is purely based on vehicle miles travelled. The Bay Area target for 2020 is 7%, the target for 2035 is 15% reduction per capita. The mark has been met for 2020 (7%), but the problem is for 2035, when the target is 15% and none of the alternatives can reach it.

MTC has developed "policy initiatives" which are separate initiatives that can be overlayed on any of the alternatives which can help further reduce greenhouse gas emissions per capita: Smart driving campaign (don't stomp on the gas, don't slam on the breaks, drive gently), 1.4%; Safe Routes to School, VanPool incentives, electric vehicle strategy, commuter benefit ordinances, telecommuting (a big player – 1.4% and could go 20% in the future) parking pricing (charge more for parking in certain areas, and people will take transit instead).

The priority development areas are scattered around Contra Costa and take up 5% of the land, and about 70% of growth may be the priority development areas. In the TRANSPAC region, there is the Martinez Downtown Intermodal Station, the Walnut Creek BART Station, the Pleasant Hill BART Station, and there are some plans in the City of Concord for the reuse of the Concord Naval Weapons Station (CNWS). There will be growth in San Ramon and Bishop Ranch.

CO<sup>2</sup> emissions in the State of California in terms of million metric tons of CO<sup>2</sup> equivalence per year for all sectors, includes industry, manufacturing, light industrial, construction, and transportation sector. In 1990, there were emissions of 427 (very important number because AB32 is based on that number). The best way to reduce emissions is to have a recession. In 2020, the goal is to be 1990 again. The Contra Costa land use forecast for the preferred alternative is 90,000 new units in the next 30 years, so 3,000 units per year.

In terms of new jobs, the forecast is 135,000 under the Jobs Housing Connection. Mr. Engelmann handed out a table which shows household and job forecast by City. Martinez seems high but the other cities seem more reasonable.

With the proposed policy initiatives, any of the alternatives can make it over the 15%. Local jurisdictions should watch these numbers closely because the RIHNA allocations depend on this.

As far as the schedule, in March ABAG and MTC decided on the land use side of the equation so comments on this will not be made until May 1. In April the transportation network part will be put in place and in May, a decision on a preferred alternative will be made. An EIR will be released in November and a draft SCS and final adoption date are proposed for April 2013.

Bob Armstrong inquired if MTC will be providing a plan for sustainable recession. Mr. Engelmann responded that MTC is coming up with a forecast that anticipates significant robust growth in the Bay Area because of the weather, best university system, high-tech center of the nation, and manufacturing is being brought back to the Bay Region. Nobody is saying that there will be another great recession.

Mr. Armstrong commented that he has never seen mention of mitigation of greenhouse gases with reforestation. Mr. Engelmann responded that reforestation is simply a temporary reduction in greenhouse gases. Plants soak it up and make wood out of it and sequester the CO2 in the wood. The plant dies eventually and when it dies, it sends all the CO2 back out in the form of methane because it deteriorates. Mr. Armstrong questioned why planting trees along the freeway shoulders had ever been considered, and Mr. Engelmann responded that it is costly to plant and maintain.

Chair Pierce advised that several agencies in the North Bay are asking for a peer review of the economic studies which were done for this, and that the Bay Area Economic Institute might do some review for a reality check on the jobs side. There is an assumption that if you don't have adequate housing the jobs won't come. Population is a modest assumption and is based on the fact that, there will be more people and more growth but we are building from a bigger base than we used to be and this is largely natural growth. It reflects the cultural changes in the makeup of the Bay Area because the different ethnicities of the Bay Area generally produce larger families than they used to. So there is a bigger population growth, which is why we need jobs. By 2040, only 48% of the adult population will be supporting the population because everyone else will be over 65. It will require different kinds of services, transportation options, and housing choices. The younger generations want apartments until the family arrives, but those generations are waiting longer to do that. The seniors are largely not wanting to age in existing high-maintenance single family homes. Seniors want nice housing with all the services, generally some form of congregate care. Providing the choices that people want in a way that doesn't pave over our green spaces to preserve our future is being considered. That is the intent of this plan.

Mr. Armstrong commented that the social engineers are forcing us to stack up and not take into consideration of the effect of property value from where you are coming to where they are forcing you. Chair Pierce responded that nobody is forcing anyone to move; it is cyclical.

Member Shinn commented that the perception is that there is a social force working against certain segments of the population.

Member Durant stated that the other component is that it's not nearly as simple as people want to make it. People looking at retirement are looking for convenience, amenities, proximity to services. People start spending less time driving as they age. In light of the numbers it is odd that reconfiguring land use will have tremendous benefits, and the reality is the numbers don't bear this out.

Chair Pierce stated that when seniors move to a really nice facility, the market will follow the demands of the public. In large cities, most of densification is 3-5 stories. It is being done in a way that it is in walkable downtowns spread throughout the region. The issue is, how to plan the transportation to be the most efficient to serve the most people.

Deidre Heitman brought up the state of education and Chair Pierce stated that it has been difficult to get the education community engaged in this process. Educators use their own numbers.

Steve Goetz asked Mr. Engelmann about the 2035 plan where the MTC made assumptions for commuting from San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Sacramento – are those assumptions changing for the sustainable community strategy and are they coordinating with San Joaquin Council governments and adjoining regions and making compatible projection? Mr. Engelmann responded that regarding the commute from the Central Valley, one of the key goals of the SCS has been to eliminate that in-commute or to stem the tide of the cars coming in from Tracy and points east. This Jobs Home Connection leaves that the way it is, because there are not enough workers in the Bay Area to fill the jobs. So, whatever is there today will keep coming and there is a little increase in the future. Environmental documents are looking at an environmental alternative that kills that commute by having everybody that works in the Bay Area live in the Bay Area. San Joaquin is not included in the model. In the future we will have one forecast on which everyone agrees.

Member Leone commented that Concord has talked about a transit-oriented hub at the Naval Weapons Station, but the City is being criticized by a large developer who believes that the consumer wants single family dwellings and that Concord will be missing the mark. There is a feeling that people want single family homes and it is nice to have ideas for transit hubs, but there are many condominiums that are not selling and are now rentals.

Chair Pierce advised that because of the recession, the rental market is higher than the sellers' market. But the Building Industry Association (BIA) is saying that most of the developers are responding and more than happy to build multifamily and smaller single family homes. The issues are the infrastructure in existing cities and the cost of retrofitting the infrastructure.

Ray Kubziak questioned Mr. Engelmann on the policy initiatives, and the percentages for bridging the gap for the 15% reduction – how reliable or realistic are these percentages? Mr. Engelmann stated that the percentages are based on empirical evidence and most are not modelable. The real question is when ABAG develops it and documents it and sends it to the Air Board, will the Air Board buy it? If the Air Board buys it, we have an SCS and if not, we have to go back to the drawing board.

**ACTION: Information Received**

**10. 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC Staff Reports**

Barbara Neustadter welcomed Marilyn Geren as the new Office Administrator for TRANSPAC/511 Contra Costa and shared that Connie Peterson will be providing assistance with the Safe Routes to School project.

Ms. Neustadter advised that the Safe Routes 2 School item (a school-based program run by 511 Contra Costa in Central and East County), is brought in part by the conversation going on at the Transportation Authority. A survey was done and people did not recognize the name as 511 Contra Costa as being their school-based program. This was because it was called “School Pool” and the name will soon be changed to “Street Smarts” to align with what goes on in Lamorinda and the San Ramon Valley.

**ACTION: Information Received**

**11. TAC Reports by Jurisdiction –**

Clayton - None

Concord - None

Martinez - None

Pleasant Hill – Eric Hu advised that the Citywide Trail Crossing did not get funded but Pleasant Hill is moving forward with construction. The project is now being advertised and the City will be breaking ground in June and finish in September.

Walnut Creek - None

Contra Costa County – Steve Goetz advised that the American Planning Association has national awards every year with 11 categories, and the Contra Costa Centre Transit Village received an award for 2012 for the implementation category. Contra Costa County is sharing the award with BART and with the developer. Congratulations were given.

**ACTION: No Action Required**

**12. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Information Received**

**13. For the Good of the Order – No Action Required**

**14. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 12, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall.